



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/557,334      04/24/2000      Glen K Okita      0600/96755      7800

24628      7590      09/21/2007  
WELSH & KATZ, LTD  
120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA  
22ND FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

IBRAHIM, MOHAMED

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2144

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

09/21/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |                                     |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/557,334 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>OKITA ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Mohamed Ibrahim   | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2144             |  |

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*MS*

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/21/2007 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebesta et al (Sebesta), U S Patent No. 6324681 in view of Gryphon et al. (Gryphon), U S Patent No. 6233537.

Regarding claim 1, Sebesta discloses a method of adding an event source to a transaction processing system having a workflow server engine "On-Line Transaction Processing OLTP" comprising (Col 2 lines 35-45 and Fig. 5): defining the event source "DCOM client/server component" in a workflow database (Col 2, lines 50-60, col 4, lines

Art Unit: 2144

55-60 and col 5, lines 5-15); [event is defined by the view file] creating at least one executable function which creates a data structure that receives events coming from the event source (Col w, line 65-col 3, line 10, col 6, lines 5-10); and creating a workflow to be executed on the workflow server engine, said workflow triggered by the executable function in response to receipt of an event from the event source "standard call from a client to OLTP" (Col 3 lines 5-15 and col 6 lines 5-15). Although Sebesta discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does explicitly disclose conditional event rule associated with the workflow and workflow triggers configured to return results to the event source.

However, Gryphon teaches conditional event rule associated with the workflow and workflow triggers configured to return results to the event source (see e.g. col. 5 line 60-col. 6 line 20, col. 6 lines 47-65, col. 7 lines 14-57 and col. 10 lines 20-40).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Gryphon with that of Sebesta. Motivation for doing so would have been to develop business processes utilizing conditions and triggers that would initialize cause the event rules to be deployed in a rapid and efficient manner.

Regarding claim 2, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the event definition includes an event id "universal unique identification UUID" (Col 6 lines 15-20 and lines 55-65).

Regarding claim 3, Sebesta- Gryphon disclose, that the created workflow is associated

Art Unit: 2144

with the event id so that the created workflow is executed in response to any event having the event id (Col 6 lines 55-65).

Regarding claim 5, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the event definition includes a list of parameters associated with the event (Col 5, lines 5-15).

Regarding claim 6, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the at least one executable function is comprised of a dynamic link library (Col 3, lines 15-25).

Regarding claim 7, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the at least one executable function is designed to send an event to the workflow server engine (Col 6, line 55-Col 7, line 2).

Regarding claim 8, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the event source is added without changing the workflow server engine (Col 3, lines 5-25). The DCOM client and server plays the role of a proxy thus there is no change in the OLTP (workflow server engine).

Regarding claim 9, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches further comprising creating at least one rule for associating an event from the added event source with the workflow (Col 2, lines 55-60). The view files details what is required of the format and how it will be used.

Regarding claim 11, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the event definition includes at

least one parameter, and that the created at least one rule includes the use of the at least one parameter (Col 2 lines 55-65).

Regarding claim 12, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that a plurality of events are defined in the workflow database, the method further comprising categorizing the events into a plurality of event types (Col 2, lines 45-60 and Col 3 lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 14, Sebesta discloses a method of adding a new subsystem "DCOM" to a workflow server engine "OLTP" having a plurality of subsystems (DCOMs for clients and servers) for providing events to the workflow server engine, the method comprising (Col 3, lines 1-30 and Fig. 5):

defining an event which will be generated by the new subsystem (Col 2 lines 50-60, Col 4 lines 55-60, and Col 5, lines 5-15):

creating a dynamic link library for creating a data structure that receives the defined event (Col 3, lines 15-25); and

associating the defined event with a workflow is executed on the workflow server

engine, said workflow triggered by the dynamic link library in response to receipt of an event from the new subsystem (Col 3, lines 5-15 and Col 6, lines 5-15).

Although Sebesta discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does explicitly disclose conditional event rule associated with the workflow and workflow triggers configured to return results to the event source.

Art Unit: 2144

However, Gryphon teaches conditional event rule associated with the workflow and workflow triggers configured to return results to the event source (see e.g. col. 5 line 60-col. 6 line 20, col. 6 lines 47-65, col. 7 lines 14-57 and col. 10 lines 20-40). The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the dynamic link library creates a data structure for the defined event (Col 3, lines 10-25).

Regarding claim 16, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that defining the event further comprises assigning an event id to the event (Col 6 lines 55-65).

Regarding claim 17, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that defining the event further comprises associating a plurality of parameters to the event (Col 2, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 18, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the plurality of subsystems also have a plurality of associated events (Col 3, lines 5-15).

Regarding claim 19, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches further comprising exchanging events between different subsystems during the execution of the workflow (Col 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 20, Sebesta discloses an apparatus for executing a transaction task within a transaction processing "OLTP" system comprising (Col 2, lines 5-15 and Fig.

5):

a plurality of event providers (Client making a standard call using C, C++, Visual Basic) for providing a source of events to the transaction processing system (Col 3, lines 1-15); a database with a workflow server application program interface that stores information relating to the events provided by the event providers (Col 2, lines 45-55 and Col 6 lines 55-65); The place of storage used by the developer to store file that will be access by the DCOM client.

a workflow server engine "OLTP" for executing workflows, said workflows triggered in response to receipt of events from the plurality of event providers (Col 3 lines 20-30); and

a workflow editor for creating and editing workflows to be executed on the workflow server engine (Col2, lines 45-55 and Col 10, lines 5-20). This is the tool used by the developer to create the service.

Although Sebesta discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does explicitly disclose conditional event rule associated with the workflow and workflow triggers configured to return results to the event source.

However, Gryphon teaches conditional event rule associated with the workflow and workflow triggers configured to return results to the event source (see e.g. col. 5 line 60- col. 6 line 20, col. 6 lines 47-65, col. 7 lines 14-57 and col. 10 lines 20-40). The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 20.

Regarding claim 21, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches further comprising:



a new event provider (Col 3, lines 1-15);

a dynamic link library associated with the new event provider for allowing the new event provider to provide events to the workflow server engine (Col 3, lines 15-25).

Regarding claim 22, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the dynamic link library allows the new event provider to provide events to the workflow server engine without changing the workflow server engine (Col 3, lines 15-30).

Regarding claim 23, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the transaction processing system collects step execution information (Col 4, lines 10-20).

Regarding claim 24, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the collected information includes information relating to the number of times a branch was executed by the workflow server engine (Col 4, lines 35-50).

Regarding claim 25, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the collected information includes information relating to the step execution time for at least one step executed by the workflow server engine (Col 4, lines 10-20).

Regarding claim 26, Sebesta discloses workflow execution system comprising:  
a workflow server engine "OLTP" adapted to execute workflow "DCOM client and server" on the workflow server engine in response to an event "standard call from a

DCOM client" (Col 3, lines 1-35 and Fig. 5):

a database server (Col 2, lines 45-55) that receives the event and that triggers the workflow server engine to execute workflow (Col 3, lines 5-25);

a plurality of subsystems for providing the events to the workflow server engine "OLTP";

and that components of the workflow server engine are standards-based components

"DCOM" (Col 3, lines 5-25).

Although Sebesta discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does explicitly disclose conditional event rule associated with the workflow and workflow triggers configured to return results to the event source.

However, Gryphon teaches conditional event rule associated with the workflow and workflow triggers configured to return results to the event source (see e.g. col. 5 line 60- col. 6 line 20, col. 6 lines 47-65, col. 7 lines 14-57 and col. 10 lines 20-40). The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 20.

Regarding claim 27, Sebesta- Gryphon teaches that the components are comprised of ActiveX controls "X/Open compliant" (Col 5, lines 1-10).

Claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebesta et al (Sebesta), U S Patent No. 6324681 in view of Gryphon et al. (Gryphon), U S Patent No. 6233537, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Du et al. (Du), U. S. Patent No. 6078982.

Regarding claim 10, Sebesta in view of Gryphon discloses the invention substantially as claimed however; they do not explicitly disclose locking mechanism for keeping the consistency of the workflow process.

Du teaches workflow management system that utilizes locking mechanism for allowing consistent and current workflow execution process (see fig. 9, col. 2 lines 32-49 and col. 9 line 44- col. 10 line 4). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the teachings of Sebesta in view of Gryphon with that of Du. Motivation for doing so would have been to produce workflow process execution that is consistent, correct, current, efficient and flexible (see Du, col. 1 lines 44-46).

Regarding claim 13, although Sebesta discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does not explicitly disclose maintaining a sorted list of currently loaded event workflow and searches the sorted workflow events.

Du teaches a queue manager that keeps track of events workflow, process instances and log of the workflow process execution (see fig 4 and col. 6 line 47-col. 7 line 33).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the teaches of Sebesta in view of Gryphon with that of Du. Motivation for doing so would have been to monitor and keep track of the execution processes of various workflow events.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Prior Art of Record***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form PTO-892 (Notice of Reference Cited) for a list of relevant prior art.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Ibrahim whose telephone number is 571-270-1132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2144

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

IMI/ *[Signature]*

*[Signature]*  
WILLIAM VAUGHN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100